

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10, and 11 have been amended. No new matter is introduced by the amendments of these claims. Claims 1-11 remain pending.

Benefit Correction:

The specification has been amended to correct the benefit claims of the present application. Specifically, Applicants are deleting a reference to the Application No. 09/244,326 from the specification and adding a reference to Application No. 09/418,469 to the specification. Application No. 09/418,469 was previously referenced on the Transmittal filed with the current application, and the filing receipt currently includes such reference.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fijolek et al (US Patent 6,510,162) in view of Kompella (U.S. patent 7,136,374). The Examiner has also rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fijolek et al. in (US Patent 6,986,157) and Kompella (U.S. patent 7,136,374) as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Rosen et al. (“BGP/MPLS VPNs’ 1999). Additionally, claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fijolek et al. in (US Patent 6,577,642) in view of Rosen et al. (“BGP/MPLS VPNs’ 1999) and Kompella (U.S. patent 7,136,374).

The Examiner has rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fijolek et al. (US Patent 6,577,642) and Rosen et al. (“BGP/MPLS VPNs’ 1999) and Kompella (U.S. patent 7,136,374) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Gilbrech (US Patent 6,173,399). The Examiner has also rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fijolek et al. (6,577,642) and Kompella (U.S. patent 7,136,374) as applied to claim 10 above and further in view of Rosen et al. “BGP/MPLS VPNs’ 1999). The Examiner’s rejections are respectfully traversed as follows.

The Examiner admits that that the primary reference Fijolek does not disclose “first node is associated with at least one VP; mapping between the first node ID and the least one VPN.” The Examiner asserts that the secondary reference Kompella discloses this feature. Since the present application is a continuation of Application No. 09/418,469 having a filing date of 15 October 1999, which predates the filing date of Kompella, it is respectfully submitted that Kompella cannot be used as prior art against the present application. It is noted that the disclosure of the parent Application No. 09/418,469 is substantially similar to the present application’s disclosure and, accordingly, fully supports the pending claims of the present application.

Additionally, the cited references fail to teach or suggest numerous other features of the claimed inventions. For example, the cited references fail to teach or suggest mechanisms for provisioning the unique first node ID (for a first node) that comprises determining a virtual private network (VPN) that is associated with the first node, selecting the unique first node ID from a set of unique ID's that are associated with the VPN of the first node, and mapping a unique second node ID with the VPN of the first node, wherein the provisioning, sending, and mapping are accomplished by one or more entities other than the first node, as claimed in claims 1 and 3. The cited references also fail to teach or suggest mechanisms for assigning and then sending a first unique identifier (ID) that is associated with the VPN per claim 5 or mechanisms for provisioning and then sending to the first node a unique identifier (ID) that is selected from a set of unique ID's that are associated with the first VPN per claim 10.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 3, 5, and 10 are patentable over the cited art of record. The Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims are also respectfully traversed. However, to expedite prosecution, all of these claims will not be argued separately. Claims 2, 4, 6-9, and 11 each depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 3, 5, or 10 and, therefore, are respectfully submitted to be patentable over cited art for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 3, 5, or 10. Further, the dependent claims require additional elements that when considered in context of the claimed inventions further patentably distinguish the invention from the cited art.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number listed at the bottom of this page.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Mary R. Olynick/

Mary R. Olynick
Reg. 42,963

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100